

Evaluating reading interventions using research-based features analysis.

1 to 1 tutorials		1 to 3 groups		1 to 7+ groups
Pupil/text matches		Most pupil/text matches		Standard texts with little pupil/text matching
Triples daily reading volume		Doubles daily reading volume		No increase in reading volume
Expert teacher provides instruction		Certified teacher provides instruction		Teaching assistant or aide or volunteer provides instruction
Focused on meaning and meta-cognition development		Some focus on meaning and meta-cognition		Focused on skills development in isolation
Easy access to interesting texts and student choice		Easy access to interesting texts some student choice		Standard texts with no student choice
Well coordinated with classroom lessons		Some coordination with classroom lessons		Standard texts with no coordination with classroom lessons

Monitoring of student progress is frequent and full – Running records, QRI, oral and silent reading comprehension		Monitoring of student progress is sporadic but full		Monitoring of student progress is narrow – DIBELS or AIMSWeb
---	--	---	--	--

Points 5

4

3

2

1

Rating your programs proximity to a research-based intervention that will accelerate student reading development.

40 Points

Very well designed

35 points

Well designed

30 points

Design could be improved

25 points

Not well matched to research

20 points

Close to traditional non-research-based designs

15 points or less

No evidence of a research-based design

® Richard L. Allington, University of Tennessee